



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,123	07/10/2000	William N. Schilit	FXPL-01022US0 MCF/TAW	8793

23910 7590 08/13/2003

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

HALIM, SAHERA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/613,123

Applicant(s)

SCHILIT ET AL.

Examiner

Sahera Halim

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 –14 has been examined.

Drawings

2. The informal drawings filed in this application are acceptable for examination purposes. When the application is allowed, applicant will be required to submit new formal drawings.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 4, line 29 is missing information. Appropriate correction is required. Moreover, the disclosure contains grammar mistakes, for example on page 13, line 1 and page 19, line 24. Please check the entire specification for these mistakes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "data content" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is not clear whether "web content data" is the same as "content data". For examination purposes they are assumed to be the same.

6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "web page data portion" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is not clear whether "the web page data portion" is the same as "the web page data file". For examination purposes they are assumed to be the same.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the link" in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is not clear whether "the link" is referring to the first link in the claim or the second link in the claim. Is unclear whether "the link" is the same "a link to a service" or "a link service". For examination purposes, it is assumed to be not referring to any of the above. It is just "a link".

8. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the identified telephone numbers" in line 8 and 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, it is assumed as "the at least one identified number".

9. Regarding claim1, the phrase "can be" in line 8 and 10 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). For examination purposes they are assumed to be not part of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-8 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Horowitz et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,647 (hereinafter Horowitz).

12. Regarding claim 1, AAPA discloses receiving a URL from a user (page 2, line 6 – 15);
accessing a Web page data file identified by the URL (page 2, line 6 – 15);

AAPA fails to disclose detecting a data portion from the Web page data portion that can be enhanced by introducing a link to a service;

identifying Web content data which can be accessed to provide a link service from a mobile device through a wireless connection;

displaying the identified data content using the link indication on a display.

However, Horowitz teaches detecting a data portion from the Web page data portion that can be enhanced by introducing a link to a service (col. 7, line 1 – col. 8, line 37 and Fig 4a – 4d);

identifying Web content data which can be accessed to provide a link service from a mobile device through a wireless connection (col. 7, line 1 – col. 8, line 37 and Fig 4a – 4d);

displaying the identified data content using the link indication on a display (col. 7, line 1 – col. 8, line 37 and Fig 4a – 4d).

Art Unit: 2157

It would have been obvious for person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the AAPA and Horowitz teachings in order to allow dynamic linking in a web content.

13. Regarding claim 2, AAPA teaches the steps of providing a user keypad selection enabling the link indication to be activated (page 3, line 2 – line 11). AAPA does not explicitly teach using the wireless connection to activate the link when the user keypad selection is made. However, AAPA suggests that these features are old and well known in the art (see page 2, line 7 –16). Having AAPA, it would have been obvious for person having ordinary skill in the art to use wireless communication to activate the links because it allows user mobility.

14. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Horowitz and further in view of Rondeau U.S. Pat. No. 5, 850,433.

15. Regarding claims, 3 and 4, AAPA and Horowitz do not disclose the Web content data is a telephone number, and wherein the link indication is activated by dialing the number. However, Rondeau discloses the Web content data is a telephone number and wherein the link indication is activated by dialing the number (Fig. 2, and col. 7, line 46 – col. 8, line 26). It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify AAPA and Horowitz by including a telephone link in the content in order to increase the capabilities of the systems disclosed by AAPA and Horowitz.

Art Unit: 2157

16. Regarding claim 5 and 6, AAPA and Horowitz do not teach the Web content data is an address, and wherein the link indication is activated by obtaining map data showing a location for the address. However, this is an obvious modifications to the systems discloses by AAPA and Howrowitz. It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horowitz and AAPA by providing a link to an address and then mapping the location in order to simplify the complexity of the system and increase user satisfaction by enabling the user to retrieve needed information from the same web page.

17. Regarding claim 12, AAPA discloses the display is provided on a device consisting of one or more of the following:

- an Internet phone (col. 2, line 19 – 30);
- a personal digital assistant (col. 2, line 19 – 30); and
- a two way pager (col. 2, line 19 – 30).

18. Reference to claim 13 and 14, AAPA and Horowitz do not teach the detection occurs in a network server and within a Web browser. However, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform the detection in a network server or and within a Web browser based on the specific needs of a specific system.

19. Regarding claim 7 and 8 are rejected over AAPA in view of Horowitz and further in view of New Jersey Institute of Technology web page in 1998 (hereinafter NJIT). AAPA and Horowitz do not teach the Web content data is an email address, and wherein the link indication

Art Unit: 2157

is activated to enable the email to be initiated. However, this features are old and well know in the art as evidence by the NJIT website in 1998. The NJIT website had an e-mail address as a link and when it was clicked, another window would pop up for initiating an e-mail (Page 1).

Knowing the website disclosed by NJIT, AAPA and Horowitz, it would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art to combine the their teachings because it would have enable a visitor initial an email without leaving the specific web page.

20. Claims 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Rondeau, U.S. Pat. No. 5,850,433 (hereinafter Rondeau).

21. AAPA discloses receiving a URL from a user (page 2, line 6 – 15);

accessing a Web page data file identified by the URL (page 2, line 6 – 15);

AAPA does not disclose identifying at least one telephone number from the content in the Web page;

displaying the identified telephone numbers for the user; and

providing a user keypad selection enabling a selected one of the identified telephone numbers to be dialed.

However, Rondeau teaches identifying at least one telephone number from the content in the Web page (Fig. 2, and col. 7, line 46 – col. 8, line 26);

displaying the identified telephone numbers for the user (Fig. 2, and col. 7, line 46 – col. 8, line 26); and

Art Unit: 2157

providing a user keypad selection enabling a selected one of the identified telephone numbers to be dialed (Fig. 2, and col. 7, line 46 – col. 8, line 26).

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify AAPA by Rondeau in order to simplify the system by enable a user to dial a number directly from a web page.

22. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of NJIT website 1998 (hereinafter NJIT).

23. Regarding claim 11, AAPA discloses receiving a URL from a user (page 2, line 6 – 15);
accessing a Web page data file identified by the URL (page 2, line 6 – 15);

AAPA does not disclose identifying at least one address from the content in the Web page;

displaying the identified address for the user;

providing a user keypad selection enabling a map to be provided showing a location for the identified address.

However, NJIT discloses a web site where the content contains an address and the address is viewable by the users and it also comprises a map link. When the map link is click a map of the address is obtained (page 1). It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention combine the teachings of AAPA and NJIT in order to enable the user to get direction and address information without leaving the specific web page.

Art Unit: 2157

24. Regarding claim 11, AAPA discloses receiving a URL from a user (page 2, line 6 – 15);
accessing a Web page data file identified by the URL (page 2, line 6 – 15);

AAPA does not disclose identifying at least one email address from the content in the
Web page;

displaying the identified email address for the user;

providing a user keypad selection enabling an email to be initiated.

However, NJIT discloses a website where an email is in the content of the Web page and
it is viewable by users and when it is selected the user is able to initiate an email (see NJIT page
1). Having the teachings of AAPA and NJIT, it would have been obvious for a person having
ordinary skill in the art at the time to the invention to include teachings of NJIT into AAPA in
order to enable a user to initiate an e-mail from the same web page.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's
disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,424,647 to Ng et al.


26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Sahera Halim whose telephone number is (703) 305-8054. The
examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached at (703) 308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sahera Halim
Patent Examiner
AU: 2157
July 30, 2003



SALEH NAJJAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER